

PRG



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/492,437	01/27/2000	Hatim Yousef Amro	AT9-99-483	9872

7590 04/07/2003

Duke W Yee
Carstens Yee & Cahoon LLP
P O Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHUOC H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/492,437

Applicant(s)

AMRO ET AL.

PR4

Examiner

Phuoc H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on January 30, 2003.
2. Pending claims 1-28, are presented for further examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beswick et al. U.S. Patent 6,480,580 in view of Meltzer et al. U.S. Patent 6,226,675.
6. Referring to claims Referring to claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 25, and 27, Beswick Referring to claims Referring to claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 25, and 27, Beswick reference discloses a hub (102 of fig. 1); and a plurality of computing devices (104n of fig. 1) in physical proximity with the hub (fig. 1); wherein each of the plurality of computing devices communicates with the hub via a wireless connection (col. 3, lines 63 through col. 4, lines 5); the hub receives and retransmits requested documents between selected computing devices (col. 4, lines 25-34); however, Beswick reference fail to disclose each of the plurality of computing devices translates each requested document into a system

independent language prior to transmitting the requested document to the hub; and each of the plurality of computing devices translates each received document from the hub.

Meltzer reference disclose each of the plurality of computing devices translates each requested document into a system independent language (ex: xml to java) prior to transmitting the requested document to the hub (ex: Router) (fig. 12; and col. 78, lines 44-60); and each of the plurality of computing devices translates (ex: java to xml) each received document from the hub (router).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Meltzer's teaching into Beswick's method to translates each requested document into a system independent language before sending and receiving from the hub; because by translating the document to the independent language, it will be allowed companies exchange information and services using self-defining, machine-readable documents, such as XML based documents, that can be easily understood amongst the partners.

7. Referring to claims 2,3,13,14,17,18,21, and 22, Beswick's reference disclose the hub receives and retransmits requested documents between selected computing devices; however, Beswick fail to disclose the document is translated into the independent languages before transmitted to the hub, and the independent languages is Java and XML.

Meltzer reference discloses the system independent language is a Java based language, and an extensible markup language (fig. 4, 12; col. 3, lines 46-57; col. 5, lines 8-19; col. 23, lines 38-60; and col. 25, lines 66 through col. 26, lines 9).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to incorporate Meltzer's teaching into Beswick's method to translates each requested document into a system independent language before sending and receiving from the hub; because by translating the document to the independent language, it will be allowed companies exchange information and services using self-defining, machine-readable documents, such as XML based documents, that can be easily understood amongst the partners.

8. Referring to claims 5-7, and 10, Beswick reference discloses at least one of the plurality of computing devices is a personal digital assistant, laptop computer, computing devices is portable (col. 1, lines 35-43, and col. 4, lines 25-34); and transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are radio frequency transmissions (fig. 1; transmitting from 104n and 102).

9. Referring to claims 9,12,16, 20,24,26, and 28, Beswick reference discloses transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are infrared transmissions (Fig. 1; ex. PDA connect to the wireless); the strength of the wireless communication signal is such that only devices in close proximity with each other may receive the signal, thus ensuring that only authorized recipients receive information conveyed via the wireless communication signal (fig. 1). It should be understand that when you use the infrared transmission rate is roughly the same transmission rates as traditional parallel ports. The only restrictions on their use is that the two devices must be within a few feet of each other and there must be a clear line of sight between them.

10. Claim 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beswick and Meltzer in view of Sopko U.S. Patent 6,003,068.

Beswick reference discloses a wireless hub, and Meltzer reference disclose each of the plurality of computing devices translates each requested document into a system independent language prior to transmitting the requested document to the hub; however, Beswick and Meltzer fail to disclose the hub is portable.

Sopko reference discloses the hub is portable (col. 2, lines 12-18).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Sopko's teaching into Beswick and Meltzer's method to use the portable hub, because it is not only small and lightweight it is also make it easier to carry from places to places.

11. Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beswick and Meltzer in view of Koperda U.S. Patent 5,790,806.

Referring to claim 8, Beswick and Meltzer reference disclose the hub receives and retransmits requested documents between selected computing devices; however, Beswick and Meltzer reference fails to teach us that the transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are encrypted.

Koperda reference discloses transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are encrypted (col. 4, lines 37-39).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Koperda's teaching into Lou's method to add the encryption and decryption to the data, because we want to make the data more secure during the transmission.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beswick et al. U.S. Patent 6,462,616

Lindgren et al. U.S. Patent 6,411,632

Luo et al. U.S. Patent 6,216,158

Feder et al. U.S. Patent 6,512,754


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5315. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Thu (7AM-4:30PM) and off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Phuoc H. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

April 1, 2003


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100